

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

Derrick Lee Cardello-Smith,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 24-12647

v.

Judith E. Levy

United States District Judge

Sean Combs,

Mag. Judge Kimberly G. Altman

Defendant.

_____/

**ORDER DENYING AS MOOT PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS FOR
INJUNCTIONS [105, 106]**

Before the Court is *pro se* Plaintiff Derrick Lee Cardello-Smith's motions "for a prohibitory injunction to enjoin Defendant Sean Combs and President Donald J. Trump from issuing a pardon or commutation to the Defendant" and "for a preliminary injunction and order to stay enforcement of the judgment of the district court while Plaintiff and Court resolves the issues of the amended complaint filing" ("Motions"). (ECF No. 105, PageID.1815; ECF No. 106, PageID.1820.) The Court denies as moot Plaintiff's Motions because the case was dismissed with prejudice on January 22, 2025. (ECF No. 93.)

In its opinion on January 22, 2025, the Court “caution[ed] Plaintiff to refrain from duplicative, frivolous, or harassing filings, including the filing of additional lawsuits related to the allegations in this case *or the filing of unnecessary papers on the dockets of cases that have been dismissed.*” (ECF No. 92, PageID.1749 (emphasis added).) The Court warned that “[f]ailure to heed this warning will result in significant pre-filing restrictions being placed on Plaintiff.” (*Id.*) It further warned that “failure to heed the Court’s warnings put[s] him at risk of incurring monetary sanctions.” (*Id.* at PageID.1751.)

Plaintiff continues to file repetitive and meritless motions in violation of the Court’s warnings.¹ (See ECF Nos. 100, 101, 102, 105, 106.) The Court reiterates that further violation of these warnings may result in an order enjoining him from future filings. *See Feathers v. Chevron U.S.A., Inc.*, 141 F.3d 264, 269 (6th Cir. 1998) (“There is nothing unusual about imposing prefiling restrictions in matters with a history of repetitive or vexatious litigation.”).

¹ Insofar as Plaintiff believes he has an actionable claim against the Michigan Department of Corrections for preventing him from accessing and filing legal documents, he may file a new lawsuit.

Accordingly, the Court DENIES AS MOOT Plaintiff's Motions.
(ECF Nos. 105, 106.)

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 4, 2025
Ann Arbor, Michigan

s/Judith E. Levy
JUDITH E. LEVY
United States District Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record and any unrepresented parties via the Court's ECF System to their respective email or first-class U.S. mail addresses disclosed on the Notice of Electronic Filing on March 4, 2025.

s/William Barkholz
WILLIAM BARKHOLZ
Case Manager